



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,268	04/04/2001	Stephane Kasriel	D33-016-02-US	4357
54092 7590 12/06/2006 NORTH OAKS PATENT AGENCY 45 ISLAND ROAD NORTH OAKS, MN 55127			EXAMINER STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,268

Applicant(s)

KASRIEL ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-24 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-24 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/25/05; 4/7/05; 7/26/05; 2/18/06;
8/17/06; 8/29/06; 10/24/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the granting of the Petition for Revival on 4 April 2005 and the amendments filed 25 March 2005.
2. Claims 1-10, 12-24, and 26-28 are pending. Claims 11, 25, and 29-40 have been cancelled by the amendment. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. The rejection of claims 2-3 and 16-17 under 35 USC 102 under Anuff has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1, 4-10, 12-15, 18-24, and 26-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Anuff et al. (US 6327628, filed 19 May 2000, hereafter Anuff).

As per independent claim 1, Anuff discloses a method for transmitting a web page, comprising steps of:

- Generating a template document from an original data document at a server
(column 4, lines 33-35: Here, the portal server generates a default portal web page. Here, the default portal web page is the original data document)
 - The template document including a set of insertion points

- Each insertion point including code fragments usable by a client (column 7, line 65- column 8, line 7: Here, the layout contains two groups, a left and right column, the groups themselves contain three and two modules. These modules are insertion points for content)
- Capable of reading changed data (column 7, lines 8-13: Here, each module is able to be a “clip” module, meaning that specific HTML elements from an HTML page are retrieved without retrieving the entirety of the page; column 2, lines 9-12: Here, the update of various resources are obtained and provided to the modules. This detection of updated resources coupled with clipping allows for changed data to be inserted into the insertion point without updating all the contents of the web page)
 - Inserting the read changed data into the template document to render a copy of the original data document at the client (column 7, lines 8-13; column 2, line 9-12)
- Receiving a request message at the server relating to the original data document (column 12, line 42- column 13, line 7: Here, when the user requests a document, the global file and the default file are initially requested)
- Sending a response message in response to the request message, the response message including the changed data (column 13, lines 1-7: Here, the global.asa.

finds the correct user object, and in combination with the default.asp. creates the appropriate modified layout)

As per dependent claim 4, Anuff discloses wherein the receiving step comprises receiving the request message formed as an HTTP protocol message and wherein the sending step comprises sending the response message as an HTTP protocol message (column 3, lines 2-24; column 6, lines 59-67: Here, the request for a webpage through a browser application is an HTTP request).

As per dependent claim 5, Anuff discloses wherein the receiving step comprises receiving the request message including information identifying at least one template document already available to a sender of the request message in a client local cache (column 2, lines 13-20; column 15, lines 47-67).

As per dependent claim 6, Anuff discloses wherein the sending step comprises sending the changed data includes the template document (column 6, lines 59-67; column 2, lines 13-20).

As per dependent claim 7, Anuff discloses wherein the sending step comprises sending the changed data includes a set of changed data from an earlier version of the original data (column 17, lines 29-37).

As per dependent claim 8, Anuff discloses wherein the sending step comprises sending the changed data includes a set of personalized data relating to a version of the original data document (column 4, lines 6-14).

As per dependent claim 9, Anuff discloses the method comprising the step of redefining the template document in response to changes in the original document (column 6, lines 47-58).

As per dependent claim 10, Anuff discloses the method wherein the redefining step comprises redefining the template document in response to the changed data being larger than a selected fraction of a size of the original data (column 6, line 47-column 7, line 26).

As per dependent claim 12, Anuff discloses wherein the code fragments include JavaScript (column 178, lines 33-35).

As per dependent claim 13, Anuff discloses the method further comprising a step of rendering the copy of the original data document at the client by parsing the template document, performing any code fragments, and inserting any changed data at the set of insertion points in the template document (column 7, lines 8-13: Here, each module is able to be a "clip" module, meaning that specific HTML elements from an HTML page are retrieved without retrieving the entirety of the page; column 2, lines 9-12: Here, the update of various resources are obtained and provided to the modules. This detection of updated resources coupled with clipping allows for changed data to be inserted into the insertion point without updating all the contents of the web page).

As per dependent claim 14, Anuff discloses wherein the changed data comprises a cookie (column 13, lines 32-38).

As per claims 15, 18-24, and 26-28, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1, 4-10, and 12-14 respectively. Claims 15, 18-24, and 26-28 are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, and further in view of Mattis et al. (US 6453319, divisional filed 15 April 1998, hereafter Mattis).

As per dependent claim 2, Anuff discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Anuff fails to specifically disclose generating a plurality of document versions for the original data. However, Mattis discloses generating a plurality of versions of a document (column 13, lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mattis with Anuff, since it would have allowed a user to provide one of a plurality of alternates (Mattis: column 13, line 55- column 14, line 9).

As per dependent claim 16, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 16 is similarly rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 25 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants arguments are focused on the belief that Anuff fails to disclose utilizing template documents with insertion points including code fragments usable by a client and able of reading changed data and inserting the changed data into the template document to render a copy of the original data document at the client (page 7). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Anuff discloses:

- Generating a template document from an original data document at a server
(column 4, lines 33-35: Here, the portal server generates a default portal web page. Here, the default portal web page is the original data document)
 - The template document including a set of insertion points
 - Each insertion point including code fragments usable by a client
(column 7, line 65- column 8, line 7: Here, the layout contains two groups, a left and right column, the groups themselves contain three and two modules. These modules are insertion points for content)

- Capable of reading changed data (column 7, lines 8-13: Here, each module is able to be a "clip" module, meaning that specific HTML elements from an HTML page are retrieved without retrieving the entirety of the page; column 2, lines 9-12: Here, the update of various resources are obtained and provided to the modules. This detection of updated resources coupled with clipping allows for changed data to be inserted into the insertion point without updating all the contents of the web page)
- Inserting the read changed data into the template document to render a copy of the original data document at the client (column 7, lines 8-13; column 2, line 9-12)
- Receiving a request message at the server relating to the original data document (column 12, line 42- column 13, line 7: Here, when the user requests a document, the global file and the default file are initially requested)
- Sending a response message in response to the request message, the response message including the changed data (column 13, lines 1-7: Here, the global.asa. finds the correct user object, and in combination with the default.asp. creates the appropriate modified layout)

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2178

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

hrs


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER